

## Editorial Comment

by Nora Hamerman

### Can Britain be saved?

One of the most intriguing developments of the week has been the emergence of a visible opposition to the Anglo-American collusion course with the Warsaw Pact in the headquarters of the Anglo-American alliance—London.

Former Prime Minister Edward Heath, who has been quite silent since Margaret Thatcher outbid him for the Conservative Party leadership four years ago, intervened into the Jan. 28 House of Commons debate with “some sharp criticisms of the government’s measures against the Soviet Union,” according to the British press.

Heath’s criticisms pursued a tack established some months back by the late Lord Mountbatten and in the summer 1979 conference in Switzerland of the London International Institute of Strategic Studies. Heath charged that the Thatcher government’s decision to break off high-level contacts with Russia, the abandonment of the Olympic Games, and the threat by London and Washington to militarily cut off Soviet access to Persian Gulf oil, merely “divert attention from what really needs to be done,” while arming of Afghan insurgents against Warsaw Pact troops is courting “grave danger.”

What needs to be done, Heath continued, is for the West to launch a global strategy—economic, political, and social, for responding to the Afghanistan situation—including economic aid to the non-aligned equal to no European country.

Mr. Heath’s remarks must be considered not merely in a British context. They follow soon after President Carter’s disastrous “State of the Union” address. They also follow the Jan. 20 and Jan. 27 nationwide television half-hour addresses on the world strategic situation by U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, who is emerging as Carter’s most serious rival for the Democratic Party mainstream electorate.

LaRouche detailed the evidence that Carter’s bluster against Moscow would lead to a confrontation in which the United States would either be forced to a humiliating backdown, or into thermonuclear World War III. And he traced the roots of the Carter administration’s policy blunders to Carter’s energy and monetary policies.

The significant feature of the Heath remarks is the implication that Britain could shift toward adopting the policy LaRouche proposes—restoring the West to healthy economic development through a new gold-backed monetary system and nuclear energy—as the only means for averting the thermonuclear holocaust. While certain British circles are weighing this option, the impact of the two LaRouche telecasts has contributed to a climate in which France and West Germany, the leaders of the European “superpower for peace” strategy, have renewed their own push for a new world monetary system, particularly following French President Giscard’s recent visit to India.

The British elite has always known—LaRouche points out—that the Adam Smith “free trade” or “free enterprise” doctrines are incompetent, but they embraced them to maintain the rule of feudal-ist aristocrats in alliance with the London rentier-financial interests. Whenever they required some actual industrial capitalist growth, as in the pre-World War I period, they grudgingly borrowed from the American System of government-backed technological progress associated with Alexander Hamilton and today with LaRouche.

Today, the saner British ruling circles have the option to adopt LaRouche’s updated version of a “Hamiltonian” policy, using Britain’s productive potential for capital-goods export to the developing sector. This is Britain’s only hope—the only real answer to Margaret Thatcher’s suicidal policies.